



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JE IN THE MIDDLE BOOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

II. ANALYSIS OF EXODUS I.-VII.¹

BY BENJAMIN WISNER BACON.

THE priestly element in Ex. i.-vii. is universally regarded among critics as comprising i. 1-7, 13 f; ii. 23^b-25; vi. 2-vii. 7, with certain minor exceptions, as follows: i. 6 and the middle clauses of i. 7 and 14 are by most attributed to JE, and by some vi. 10-30 is attributed in whole or in part to R. The genealogy, vi. 14-27, is generally regarded as a portion of P²'s material, which having been removed from its original position is inserted here by means of vs. 13 and 28-30. As these verses are obviously made in the clumsiest possible imitation of vi. 2 ff. and 10-12, they are no doubt rightly assigned to R. A more difficult question is as to the source of the material which by this means is so curiously patched in to the otherwise fluent narrative of P. A genealogy we should certainly expect, to introduce Moses and Aaron, who now appear abruptly, as though the reader were expected to know in advance who they are. Such an introduction is, indeed, more conceivable in P than in J or E, but is scarcely conceivable in any writer. P, therefore, probably had a genealogy introducing these principal characters. But that is not what vi. 14 ff., in its present form, is. Rather does it undertake to be a table of the clans of Israel, a duplicate of Gen. xlv. 8 ff. It begins with Reuben and Simeon, but proceeds only as far as Levi, and stops abruptly when it reaches the names of Aaron and Moses. This phenomenon might be accounted for by supposing that we have here only a part of the original table; but from the characteristic inclusiveness of redactors, it is probable *a priori* that the facts are to be accounted for rather by supposing addition to an original genealogy of Levi, than subtraction from a table of all the clans of Israel. This *a priori* probability is supported by the colophon in vs. 19 and 25,

¹ See *Journal* Vol. ix. 161-200.

"These are the families of the Levites according to their generations," "These are the heads of the father's houses of the Levites according to their families," in place of the simple "These are the families of Reuben," "These are the families of Simeon," of vs. 14 f. I incline therefore to the opinion that the table was originally a table of the "*Toledoth* of Levi," comprising vs. 16-25, which stood before vi. 2, and when removed was supplemented at the beginning (vs. 14 f.) from Gen. xlv. 8 ff., and tacked on to the narrative by means of the patchwork vi. 13 and 26-30. (With vi. 16 cf. i. 1, and contrast v. 14.)

Turning now to JE in this section, the reasons given by Dillmann seem to me adequate for including i. 6 and the clauses *וירבתי ייעצמי* and *בשרה ובכל-עברה* in vs. 7 and 14 in JE.² The language of i. 6, 7^a β, 8-12, 14^a β, is distinctly J's. With *עצם* 7, 9, 20, cf. Gen. xviii. 18, xxvi. 16; Num. xxii. 6. *רבו* 10, Gen. xi. 3, 4, 7, xxxviii. 16. *פרץ* 12, Gen. x. 18, ix. 19, xi. 9, xxviii. 14, xxx. 30, 43, etc. *קרה* = *קרא* "befall" 10, Gen. xlii. 4, 38, xli. 1; Ex. v. 3. *קרך* 12, Gen. xlv. 34. *שנאיני* 10, Gen. xxiv. 60. *ענה* "humble" 11 and 12, Gen. xvi. 6, xxxi. 50, xxxiv. 2. *רעמסס* 11, xiii. 37. *עלה* 10, *passim*. (Also E.) *חמר ולבנים* 14, Gen. xi. 3. *עליכן* 11, *J passim*.

Not merely is the language of vs. 6, 8-12 characteristic of J, — the ideas belong with the conceptions of this writer. The death of Joseph and his generation, vs. 6, cannot be so placed in E, for E has immediately before (Gen. i. 24, 26) twice mentioned the death of Joseph. The idea of vs. 9 is identical with Gen. xxvi. 16, and identically expressed. In Num. xxii. 2 ff. the same idea recurs again in the same expressions (cf. Num. xxii. 3^b with Ex. i. 12^b; Num. xxii. 6 with Ex. i. 9), but coupled with a slightly different conception in different terms, which seem to be E's.

In vs. 11 f. the means taken to break the spirit of Israel agree with both the idea and expressions of J in the following passages: "Affliction by taskmasters" (here *סרי מסיס*, elsewhere *ננשים*, the sense being identical) is Israel's complaint iii. 7 (J). The same means of repression is resorted to in v. 5 f., 9 ff. (J), when Pharaoh discovers a disposition to restlessness in the people. Finally occupation in public works, such as the building of store (?) cities, is an expedient adapted to a people dwelling in large numbers together, but scarcely applicable

² Cf. Gen. xviii. 18, xxvi. 16; and cf. vs. 9 and 20 with vs. 7 and Gen. xi. 3; and vs. 11 with 14. Verse 6 prepares for vs. 8; cf. with it Jud. xi. 10.

where the conception is, as it seems to be in E, that of domestic service like the bondage of Joseph, Israel being scattered among the dwellings of the Egyptians. Accordingly, I do not consider that there is a logical progress from the expedients of "affliction" of Israel by "taskmasters" in vs. 10-12 to the expedients of vs. 15-22; or rather, I think that what logical progress there is, is in the intention of JE' alone, who combines the two narratives; whereas the material itself presents two accounts more parallel in thought than consecutive. On the other hand, the attempt to subdivide vs. 8-14 on the ground of a lack of logical consecutiveness in vs. 11 f. after vs. 9 f. by denying that the "affliction" was originally an expedient directed against the growing power of Israel, suffers shipwreck upon vs. 12, where the expedient of "affliction" is declared to have had the opposite effect from that intended, referring thus explicitly to 7^aβ and 9.

Chap. i. 6, 7^aβ, 8-12, 14^aβ belong therefore together, and, with vs. 20^b, which is out of harmony with its surroundings, and of course belongs with vs. 7^aβ, 9, are to be assigned to J.

No argument is needed to prove that i. 15-22, except 20^b, belong to E. All that is lacking, probably, is some brief statement of the growth of Israel and of the "oppression wherewith the Egyptians oppressed them." Possibly this was coupled with the statement of a desire on the part of the Egyptians to cut down the numbers of Israel. This latter, however, does not seem to me to enter essentially into the thought of E. If any motive beyond a mere hatred is presupposed in this paragraph, it need be nothing more than a general policy toward a hated community in a particular city; or the Hebrews may be supposed to suffer in common with a whole slave-class whose increase Pharaoh proposes to keep down. The idea of Israel as a nation large enough to be a menace to Egypt, against whom measures of open coercion are taken to humble them and break their spirit by forced labor, is certainly incongruous with the conception of *two* midwives employed to deliver Egypt from its fear of a subject nation grown too many and too mighty for them. If, then, it is possible to understand E's narrative without introducing this inconsistency, we ought to do it. Now what gives the story of Pharaoh's policy of infanticide operated by two midwives its appearance of ridiculous inadequacy is the fact that our minds have previously been filled from vs. 8-12 with the conception of a great enslaved nation. Remove this idea, and let E's narrative suggest its own setting, and there is no

absurdity. We see the Hebrews still a mere clan quietly living in one of the cities of Egypt, the royal city, and scattered as individuals among the Egyptians' dwellings; oppressed, hated, forced into menial service, but not as yet made the object of open national coercive measures. An unexplained antipathy — race prejudice perhaps — leads to the king's attempt secretly to rid himself of them. When the midwives refuse to do his will, he suggests to his people the same measure of infanticide. Certainly we should not gather from what we have here, that Israel is a nation by itself, of which Egypt is afraid, and against which measures of open coercion have already been taken. In short, I do not think that the story of Egyptian warfare on the growing power of Israel by reduction to labor on public works under military control is the product of the same mind as that which represents it operating by means of midwives and infanticide. The former is the conception of J, who thinks of Israel as a nation living in their own district of Goshen; the latter, of E, who thinks of them as individuals in domestic relations with Egyptian neighbors in the royal city.

The story of the childhood of Moses is purely E's. Chapter ii. 1-10 is universally recognized as belonging as a whole to this document. It is inseparable from the foregoing, where infanticide is the method of warfare against Israel: its scene is not Goshen, but the city on the bank of the Nile which E has always before his mind's eye, where Pharaoh's palace is, and whence his daughter comes down to "the river's brink" (vii. 15): the language is unmistakable; *אֶמְהָ, יִלֵּד*, and the form of etymology in vs. 10, — all make this assignment positive. If there is a slight unevenness of the Hebrew in vs. 6, it is entirely inadequate to suggest (Wellhausen) a parallel account from J. E had sources, doubtless poetic, which he reduced to a continuous prose narrative. Such inequalities of language as that in ii. 6 are inevitable, where a writer is following a source as closely as E must, for reasons to be presented later, have followed his. I see no reason to assume that the story of Moses' childhood was told also in J. Why may it not have been found in E only, just as the childhood of Samuel is presented by one writer only (E?), the other beginning his story with the career of his hero in maturity? The story of E has obviously been mutilated in ii. 1 by the omission of data concerning Miriam (vs. 4) and Aaron (iv. 27), and the names of Moses' parents; doubtless because the statements conflicted with P, vi. 20 ff. J's

story will be perfectly complete, if, after the narrative of the reduction of Israel to public works under task-masters, we come direct to the story of the killing of the Egyptian by Moses, or whatever the outbreak was which compelled his flight to Midian.

But in ii. 11-14 also, we are still following E. "When Moses was grown up he went out unto his brethren" presupposes vs. 10, where he is a child in Pharaoh's house. The four verses are necessary to E, to bring Moses again into relation with his own people. Their language is not distinctively characteristic, though Dillmann regards אָנָּךְ, 14^b, as Yahwistic on account of its occurrence once in Gen. xxviii. 16; but this single instance, supported by a doubtful passage, is scarcely enough to prove anything. Closer examination of the language is unnecessary, as the assignment of the verses to E is not seriously disputed.

Verses 15-23^a, in spite of the good connection with 11-14, are J's. Jülicher stands alone, so far as I know, in disputing this. But vs. 23^a, in its real connection with iv. 19 (indisputably J), makes it practically certain that vs. 15 is J; and, as Schrader has pointed out, the motive for flight is not quite the same in vs. 14 as in 15. Let me also mention here, what will be more fully discussed later, that Num. xii. 1 suggests not Midian but Cush as the place of Moses' flight and marriage in E. It is J who takes an interest in priests (Ex. xix. 22 ff., xxiv. 1 f., 9 f.) and in matrimonial alliances in priestly families (Gen. xli. 45 — surely J, since E has "Potiphar"). The scene at the well, Ex. ii. 15^b ff., is a favorite one with J, cf. Gen. xxiv. 11 ff., xxix. 3 ff. The one son of Moses and Zipporah as his wife are in accord with iv. 24-26, while the former statement at least differs from xviii. 5. Finally, whatever is done with "Reuel" in vs. 18, it is certain that "Jethro" never stood there, and consequently that the verse was not written by the author of iii. 1.

Moreover, the language of vs. 15-23^a is certainly characteristic of J. Compare וַיִּבְקֹשׁ לְחַיֵּי with iv. 24; רַחֲמִים is found only in Gen. xxx. 38, 41 (J); מְרִיבָהּ בְּאֵימֵי רַחֲמֵי רַחֲמֵי reminds us of Gen. xxvii. 20; לָמָּה זֶה frequently in J, but also in E; עֹבֵד 20, Gen. ii. 24, xxiv. 27, xxviii. 15, xxxix. 6, 12, 13, 15, 18, xliv. 22, l. 8; Ex. ix. 21; Num. x. 31 (J). In E it is found only in the expression "forsake Yahweh," Josh. xxiv. 16, 20.

Various methods of accounting for "Reuel" in vs. 18 have been suggested. Dillmann proposes to supply רֵעֵה, which makes the

passage agree with Num. x. 29; but he fails to account for the loss of these two important words. If any change has occurred in the text here, it is not likely to have been in the direction of increasing the contradiction between this and other passages, but of harmonization. Now the style of the passage and the general practice of J, as well as of every good writer, would require the name of the priest of Midian to be inserted, if in this passage at all, in vs. 16, where he first appears. But in both vs. 16 and 21 he is nameless ("the man"), as is frequently the case in J (cf. Abram's servant Gen. xxiv.; Joseph's master, the Egyptian, Gen. xxxix.). From this fact, and from the awkwardness which the introduction of any name would produce in vs. 18, I conclude with Wellhausen that "Reuel" is simply an interpolation. But why should an interpolator have introduced the name "Reuel" in apparent conflict with iii. 1, immediately following? Why did he not write "Hobab son of Reuel," which would have at least agreed with Num. x. 29 and Judg. iv. 11? Because either Jethro or Hobab would have been in agreement with two passages only, at the expense of contradicting two others; whereas by giving the word רֵוֶל in iii. 1 and elsewhere a more general sense, and understanding it as "brother-in-law," Reuel might be regarded as the father-in-law, and Jethro and Hobab as both brothers-in-law of Moses. This was a precarious way of avoiding a contradiction, to be sure, since it is tolerably clear from the context that the priest of Midian had seven daughters only, and not, beside them, two sons, who could have defended their sisters; but it did avoid any point-blank contradiction, and hence might be preferred to "Hobab son of Reuel" or "Jethro." The motive for this interpolation would, of course, be the desire to harmonize J and E.

Dillmann (*Ex. u. Lev. in loc.*) suggests that vs. 22^b has been taken by R from xviii. 3, where it formed part of E's story. The identity of the two verses is indeed significant. But it seems more probable that the relation between them is the reverse of that assumed by Dillmann; for in ii. 22 it is necessary to suppose that J had the account of the birth of the son mentioned in iv. 24-26, and there is no reason to suspect any corruption of the passage; whereas it is certain that xviii. 3 has been harmonistically worked over, and the clause is so far from being necessary to the story as there told, that, on the contrary, the mention of the birth and naming of the sons is brought in too late, and in a very awkward way. Only read the passage and observe the

style — "And Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, took Zipporah, Moses' wife, after he had sent her away, and her two sons, of which the name of the one was Gershom; for he said," etc. If we are to choose between this passage and the perfectly smooth, natural order of ii. 22, as to which is to be regarded as interpolated, we cannot very well hesitate in the choice. If vs. 22 did not stand just where it does in J's narrative we should have to supply it. It is in xviii. 3 f. that we have supplementation; doubtless in part (vs. 4) from E's material.

Verse 23^a also stands just in its original position. After his marriage and the birth of his son, J has nothing further to relate of Moses' stay in Midian except his return. As appears from iv. 19 Moses has simply been waiting for it to be safe for him to return to Egypt. Chap. ii. 23^a cannot be placed after the theophany of chap. iii., for the author would certainly not describe Moses as divinely charged with the commission, "Go, and gather the elders of Israel together," etc. (iii. 16), and then go on and describe him as quietly sitting still till "in the course of those many days the king of Egypt died." On the other hand ii. 23^a cannot be separated from iv. 19 f.; for which reason LXX repeats it before the latter. There is no room in J's narrative for the insertion of a theophany and a message to Israel and Pharaoh, between ii. 23^a and iv. 19 f. The occasion for Moses' return from Midian is simply the death of those who sought his life. If the divine commission to liberate Israel was the motive, as in chapter iii., this quite supersedes ii. 23^a. There is no legitimate alternative to connecting ii. 23^a immediately with iv. 19. The exclusion of the matters narrated in chap. iii. from this part of the narrative is corroborated by the incident iv. 24-26. If Moses is Yahweh's agent, Yahweh can scarcely be supposed to try to kill him when he is on his way to try to fulfil his mission. If anything is wrong about Moses, Yahweh will first set him right, and then make him his agent. As Jülicher has seen, the commission to Moses from Yahweh comes in Goshen *after* his return to Egypt. The J elements of chap. iii. have been removed from their original setting for combination with the E narrative, whose scene was at Horeb. In J, Moses fled to Midian; married there; returned with wife and child when it was safe; met Yahweh at the lodging-place, and *after* a trial of his courage in the struggle of iv. 24-26, when once more in Goshen, was commissioned by Yahweh to deliver Israel. P has followed the authority of J in making Egypt the scene of the divine charge.

It would appear from the above, that we must expect to find E's narrative as the basis of Ex. iii. f., and only fragments from the story of J woven in. That such is the case, critics generally have perceived from the style and language of chap. iii. In iii. 1-6 the characteristics of E are so marked as to admit of no doubt. "Jethro," "Horeb," "the mountain of God"; the formula of address, "Moses, Moses, and he said Here am I"; the expressions *מראה*, *אלהי אביך*, are decisive. But we are warned by the recurrence of *יחיה* to expect traces of J. In vs. 2 and 4 *יחיה* is obviously a mere alteration of R from *אלהים*, as in Gen. xxii.; for there is absolutely no trace, as yet, of duplication in the narrative. J E', however, is preparing to introduce his J material. I think there is reason to suspect that, beside altering *אלהים* to *יחיה* in vs. 2 and 4, he introduced the two words *מדין* *בן* in vs. 1. They serve the purpose of identifying Jethro with the character of the preceding section, ii. 15 ff., which, however, is J's. In all but one other case E's expression omits these words. In xviii. 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 17, 24, 27 he is described simply as "Jethro, Moses' father-in-law." The one other case where he is designated as in J, "priest of Midian," is xviii. 1, where we have the exact equivalent of iii. 1; and where, moreover, there is independent reason to suspect the hand of R. Now, as already noted, Num. xii. 1 (certainly E) represents Moses wife as a Cushite woman. It is difficult to suppose that any other than Zipporah is meant, especially as it will appear hereafter that Num. xii. stood originally in close connection with Ex. xviii., where the coming of Jethro and Zipporah is related. We are justified, therefore, I think, in regarding *מדין* *בן* in iii. 1 and xviii. 1 as a harmonistic interpolation of J E'; especially as it has no significance in the sentence, and E displays no fondness for priests anywhere else.

One other slight change I think was effected by R; viz. the inversion of the original order of vs. 6^a and 6^b. What God says in 6^a must go with the rest of the message (v. 9), and should not be interrupted by the relation of Moses' action. This change will make the style much smoother. The inversion may be due to the reflection on R's part that Moses would not know the divinity of his interlocutor and so hide his face, until specially told; but the action of vs. 6^b is perfectly natural after vs. 5.

In vs. 7 f. we come upon an unmistakable fragment of J. *יחיה* is significant; *ראה עני* is a direct reference to Ex. i. 11 f., and is more-

over a frequent phrase with J (cf. Gen. xvi. 11, xxix. 32; Ex. iii. 17, and iv. 31); the suffering under "taskmasters," נגשים, is consonant with J's idea. "I am come down to deliver them" reminds us of Gen. xi. 5, xviii. 21; "land flowing with milk and honey" is a constant expression of J, see vs. 17, xiii. 5, xxxiii. 3; Num. xiii. 27, xiv. 8, xvi. 14; Josh. v. 6; cf. Gen. xliii. 11. It appears often in combination with the list of Canaanite peoples, which is Yahwistic in at least a secondary sense.³ These two verses are parallel to vs. 9 f., where the phraseology also is different (לחץ instead of ענה).

Verses 10-14 are unmistakably and indisputably E's, and do not need to be dwelt upon. Verse 15 is also generally recognized as a didactic interpolation in the Deuteronomic style, superfluous and having no pertinence to the narrative.

Verses 16 f. form the sequel to and repeat the language of 7 f., constituting thus J's parallel to 6^a, 9 f. (cf. אלהי אברהם אביך with אלהי אברהם, v. 16). Verse 16 supplies what is perhaps the only missing element of J's narrative before vs. 7, וירא יצירה אל משה, a fragment which perhaps suggested the alteration of אלהים to יצירה in v. 2.

Verse 18, in which, in accordance with vs. 16, the elders of Israel appear with Moses as commissioned to present the demand of Israel to Pharaoh, is obviously related to a series of J passages frequently referred to in my former article; viz. v. 3, viii. 23, etc. It declares that the elders of Israel will hearken to Moses' voice, as in iv. 31, but contrary to iv. 1.

Verses 19, 20 seem more doubtful. They have been assigned by Jülicher to D² on grounds of style and doctrinal interest. But there must have been in E some reference to the great wonders to be done before Pharaoh, to which iv. 17 alludes; for the signs which are to be done with the rod cannot possibly be those of iv. 1-9, only one of which is wrought by the means of the rod; and moreover it is the signs before Pharaoh which are of principal importance. Again, the expression ל נתן, 'suffer, permit,' is characteristic of E (cf. Gen. xx. 6, xxxi. 7; Num. xx. 21), and בירד חזקה appears, outside of D² passages, only in Num. xx. 21 (E). The phrase, however, contradicts vs. 20, vi. 1, and xiii. 9, unless we adopt some conjectural reading, such as לא אע for לא יע (LXX, Ew.). The expression נפלאה occurs again in xxxiv. 10 (D²), and differs from the אורח which E speaks of

³ If interpolated, as it sometimes seems to be, it is an interpolation nowhere found in E.

elsewhere in this connection. I conclude, therefore, that some promise in E of the signs to be wrought before Pharaoh underlies iii. 19 f., which in its present form, however, must be attributed to D² (cf. iv. 21 and Deut. xxxiv. 10–12).

With verses 21, 22 the case is different. Not the flocks and herds of the nation dwelling in Goshen (Gen. xlvi. 28 ff.), but the jewels borrowed from Egyptian neighbors among whom the people are scattered in domestic relations, are the wealth carried up from Egypt. The passage is connected with xi. 1–3, xii. 35 f., and is certainly E's.

All critics, I believe, assign iv. 1–9 to J, and Jülicher even makes this his point of departure. "Um vom möglichst sichersten auszugehen," he says in assigning the passage to J. But I am compelled to dissent from even so universal an assumption as this. I think there are reasons for assigning the passage to E, and although it is not perhaps, a necessity to the analysis I have advanced for other passages, and I do not wish to insist upon this assignment, still the reasons for regarding iv. 1–9 as E's seem to me to deserve consideration.

First, however, it will be necessary to consider what has been urged in favor of J. The only argument from style, language, or subject-matter which I have been able to discover is Wellhausen's, which is as follows: "Bestimmt auf J führt namentlich 4, 1–9. Denn hier werden die Zeichen, die Mose tut, von den Aegyptischen Plagen — die nachher Jahve allein bewirkt — unterschieden." Here the argument seems to rest upon the word *אֵימָת*, and the impression conveyed is that J distinguishes between 'signs' and 'plagues,' whereas E has only 'signs,' which are identical with the plagues. "Eine ganze andere Vorstellung, die nach dem, was wir über Kap. 7–10 erkannt haben, sicher auf E führt, findet sich 4, 21. 27. Hier sind wie in Q die Zeichen, die Mose verrichten soll, eben die Plagen, er tut sie vor Pharaon, nicht vor dem Volke, der Stab ist bei allen das notwendige Vehikel."

Is it true that J makes this discrimination between signs and plagues? No; for the expression, "To-morrow shall this sign (*אֵימָת*) be" (viii. 19) belongs to the very framework of J. Is it true that E knows no signs but the plagues, and that if he had had such a story of miracles for the authentication of Moses before the people (for this is the core of the argument), he would not have spoken as he does in iv. 17 about doing the 'signs' with the rod? No;

for Moses receives a sign (רָא) in iii. 12 where the rod has no part to play.

Still it must be admitted that if E knows no signs to the people, iv. 17 will be clearer. But if we can suppose E to have contained such a passage as iv. 1-9, and still no ambiguity arise in iv. 17, no evidence for or against iv. 1-9 can be derived from it. To me it seems not a forced supposition to assume that E expected the reader to make the two self-evident exceptions to the rule of iv. 17.

There is one other reason which may have had weight in the assignment of these verses to J; viz. that Yahweh is the divine name employed. This brings up one of the most important questions for the analysis of JE in the Middle Books. How shall we account for the use of Yahweh and Elohim in E after Ex. iii. 13? We should expect one of three things; either that he would *a.* use Yahweh as P does after vi. 2, with special exceptions for reasons connected with the sense, as in P Ex. viii. 15 and xxxi. 18, and in J *passim*; but this is certainly not the case, for long sections of E subsequent to this have Elohim without regard to appropriateness according to sense. *b.* We might expect that from force of habit he would continue to use Elohim as heretofore, content with his statement of the fact of the revelation of the name Yahweh, without himself adopting it. That this is not the fact is observable in every analysis of E that has ever been made in the later Hexateuchal books. E certainly uses Yahweh from time to time; and the use cannot be accounted for as due to editorial change, for it is in one respect too constant and in another not constant enough. That is, it is neither an accidental nor a systematic change. *c.* We might expect that he would follow no particular system, but use Yahweh and Elohim indifferently, as it happened, or as the sense seemed to dictate. But neither is this the case; for the use of the names is not accidental, but certain long passages are characterized by Elohim breaking in suddenly upon other parts of the same E context — parts inseparable from one another — where Yahweh is the name employed. Kuenen refers to the phenomenon as follows: "We should naturally expect that this particular characteristic of E [the use of Elohim] would now disappear, but the facts do not confirm our expectation: Elohim and Ha-elohim still characterize the document, even after Ex. iii. 15, though we cannot follow its traces at all easily. It is only here and there that we can detect it with certainty amongst the prophetic elements of Ex. iii. 16-

xii. Subsequently it reappears in Ex. xiii. 17-19, 21, 22; xiv. 19^a (and 19^b); xv. 22-26; xvii. 1^b-7, 8-16; xviii.; and then again in Ex. xix. 9^a, 10-17; xx. 18-21, 1-17; xxiv. 12-14, 18^a."⁴ Kuenen attributes all these passages to E, but he offers no explanation of the use of Yahweh in some of them, and in other passages which he assigns to this source. In fact, I do not know of any theory which has ever been presented in explanation of this phenomenon, but offer one which seems to me to meet all the requirements of the case.

The use of Elohim is something which characterizes only certain sections of E's narrative; outside of these particular sections it occurs only in certain stereotyped phrases, like rod of God, mount of God, angel of God. We must, therefore, look for the cause behind E to that which these sections and the fixed phrases have in common, which can be nothing else than derivation from a common source using Elohim and Ha-elohim habitually throughout. In the sections which E took substantially unaltered from this source he naturally left the name Elohim just as it was, or changed it only for a few paragraphs (cf. Yahweh Elohim in Gen. ii. f.). In Gen. i. - Ex. iii. he would, of course, take pains to use only Elohim; but after having narrated the revelation of the name Yahweh in Ex. iii. 13 f., he himself would naturally employ Yahweh, and would, of course, leave Yahweh unaltered in any Yahwistic sources he may have had, just as he leaves Elohim in his main source.

I can conceive no other circumstances which would account for the use of Elohim in certain sections and Yahweh in others, the work itself being a unit.

The hypothesis is confirmed by the practice of a writer whose sources for the most part lie before us. Out of more than three hundred cases in which the Deuteronomist speaks of the Deity there are just seven in which he writes Elohim. In five of these cases we have an unmistakable quotation from an Elohistic source; in the other two there is independent reason to believe the same to be the case. Deut. i. 15-17 quotes with in part a verbal exactness the Elohistic passage Ex. xviii. 13-27, the thought of Deut. i. 17, "the judgment is God's," being obviously derived from this connection, though the original phrase is not traceable. In iv. 32 f. the evidence is positive: *ברא אלהים אדם על הארץ* can be explained in no other way

⁴ *Hexateuch*, p. 141.

than as a reference to Gen. i. 27, or since there is every reason to think D totally unacquainted with P, to an Elohist J² underlying Gen. i., as assumed by Budde.⁵

In Deut. iv. 33 the clause with Elohim is a reference to Ex. xix. 10 and xx. 1. "Elohim spake" (E). Elohim in vs. 34 is susceptible of the translation "a god," and is hence omitted, though otherwise to be counted in favor of the hypothesis. Deut. v. 24 is again a reference to Ex. xix. 19, xx. 1, "Elohim spake"; ix. 10 quotes verbally Ex. xxxi. 18 (E), "written with the finger of Elohim"; xxi. 23, "He that is hanged is the curse of God," appears to be a current saying; and, finally, xxv. 18 refers to an episode, Ex. xvii. 8 ff., found only in E, and is, moreover, a characteristic expression of this writer (cf. Gen. xx. 11, xxii. 12, xxxi. 42, 53, xlii. 18; Ex. i. 17, 21, xviii. 21). The practice attributed to E finds, therefore, in D a perfect analogy; these seven exceptions being scarcely susceptible of any other explanation.

The second fact confirmatory of the theory is that nearly all the distinctively archaic *material* of E, as e.g. the Ten Words, the Book of Judgments, Ex. xxi. f., the Song of Balaam, the story of Jethro's visit, is of this Elohist character, while it is in the sections and phrases in general which E himself might have written or which he might have derived from another than his principal source, that Yahweh is found; e.g. Ex. xxiv. 3-8, where we have the characteristic *maçseboth*, young men as priests (*contra* Ex. xix. 22 (J)), and other unmistakable indications of an integral part of E's work, and yet Yahweh throughout the paragraph.

We may be certain that E had a written source before him from the relationship of this document to J. J is not a mere edition of E; nor is E an edition of J, for the resemblance is not verbal, but only in the material. On the other hand if only a common stock of traditions had been at the disposal of both, it is incredible that each should have made practically the same selection of material; especially as J would not have been likely out of such a common stock to confine himself to almost the same list of *northern* sagas which E presents. The relationship of the two is so close as to make absolutely necessary the

⁵ A personal communication from Professor Budde assures me of his entire agreement with me in this treatment of Deut. iv. 32 f., and even refers to it as "ein schöner Beweis die mir ganz neu war und für mich eine grosse Genugthuung."

assumption of a common source. This can only have been an *Ephraimite* source, as is shown by the fact that the interest of both narratives is so preponderantly northern (observe, e.g. the relative space given to the story of Joseph); a largely poetic source, as appears from the great number of poetic fragments and the free distribution of poetic words and expressions throughout the prose narrative both in J and E; doubtless, then, an anthology of legends and ballads connected by brief prose introductions, such as we suppose the Book of Jashar and the Book of the Wars of Yahweh to have been. Both these are employed and cited by E. He may have had a third source which was his principal one, but it is more probable, *a priori*, from the slight development of literature, that he did not have more than two histories of Israel in his library; and, from the fact that J has so nearly the same material, it is practically certain that E had *one* main source which is common to him and to J. Now the Book of the Wars of Yahweh must have included an account of the overthrow of Pharaoh, the war of Yahweh *par excellence*; and it cannot have had material relating to events more remote, because before the deliverance of Israel from Egypt there were no "wars of Yahweh." Here, then, was a secondary source, from its title certainly Yahwistic, coming in at just about the point where E begins to inform us that Yahweh is the personal name of the Deity whom he has hitherto spoken of as Elohim. His main source, on the other hand, was Ephraimite and Elohist, and, according to Josh. xxiv., went back at least to the call of Abraham. We may suppose that it was not the Book of Jashar, but still a third book of historical poems; but there is no reason why we should not suppose that it was the Book of Jashar itself, in an Elohist edition, and that E followed the Elohist practice of this book, making room for the use of Yahweh when he came to take up his Yahwistic source, by the narrative of Ex. iii. 13. But, whether or not it was these particular sources which furnished E his material and which account for his introduction of the story of the revelation of the divine name at just this point, it seems to me certain that an Ephraimite anthology is the common basis underlying both J and E; and as E himself certainly uses Yahweh after Ex. iii. 13, whereas the main part of his material just as certainly uses Elohim and Hae-lohim, I infer that this main source was throughout Elohist.

To return now to Ex. iv. 1-9. The passage uses Yahweh. But even if E did not write it in his own language, as he certainly might

easily have done (and if our hypothesis is correct he must have written in his own language the immediately preceding passage iii. 13 f.), he would be apt to alter Elohim to Yahweh for at least a paragraph or two after those verses in his material. I consider, accordingly, that after Ex. iii. Yahweh is absolutely without weight as evidence for J rather than E, while Elohim and Ha-elohim are evidence for E. What now is the situation of the narrative? Precisely that of iii. 1-6 (E). Moses is in the open air before Yahweh, in the daylight, with a rod in his hand such as shepherds are wont to carry. So in fact we should expect if the situation is that of the shepherd on Horeb. But if he is in Egypt, and, as is at least likely to be the case in J, Yahweh comes to him in a dream, why should he have a rod in his hand? Add now the fact that the "rod of God" is a constant element in E's subsequent narrative, unexplained unless this narrative is E's, but is absolutely *unknown* to J, and the rod must surely count strongly for E.

The sign of leprosy is equally characteristic of E. Both the conception itself of leprosy suddenly inflicted by God as a sign and the expression "leprous as snow" are met with only in E, Num. xii. 10; cf. also 2 Kings v. 10, 14, 27, — a chapter which displays several peculiarities of E. A significant parallel to the reversing of the sign for its corroboration is the Elohist passage Judg. vi. 36 ff. The third sign likewise bears the marks of E's conceptions. If J conceives Israel as on "the river" at all, he gives no sign of it; whereas in E the river plays a large part in the scenes transpiring in Egypt. Finally, this passage joins on to iii. 21 f.; and although, by referring the personal pronouns of vs. 1 to the elders of Israel of vs. 16-18, we might perhaps obtain as good a sense, the flat declaration in vs. 1, "But behold they will not believe me," does not follow well immediately after the assurance of Yahweh, vs. 18, "They shall hearken unto thy voice." The signs seem from their character as addressed to the people to be the counterpart of the 'token' Moses receives for his own assurance in iii. 12. In other words they serve the purpose of convincing the people that Moses is an agent of Yahweh entrusted with special powers for the purpose he is commissioned to fulfil, which of course is a far more important thing than merely going with the elders to ask a three-days leave of absence to hold a feast. No supernatural corroboration of his word would be needed to induce the elders to go with Moses and present this request to Pharaoh.

They would naturally hearken to his voice. It is when he presents himself as an agent commissioned to undertake at once the whole task of securing entire liberation from Pharaoh, as in iii. 9-14, that Moses is in need of evidence to prove that the power has been given him.

Chapter iv. 10-13, on the other hand, is full of expressions of J; cf. Gen. xliii. 20, xliv. 18, *בִּי אֲדֹנָי*; cf. v. 23, ix. 24; Gen. xxxix. 5; and here the outlook also is different. It is not a question of inducing the people to believe him really empowered to effect deliverance, of having, and being able to exhibit, the supernatural powers which will be necessary; but simply whether Moses is "a man of words," i.e. will be able to act as a spokesman and as Yahweh's mouthpiece and ambassador. This objection is overcome, but not as would appear from what follows, by the appointment of Aaron to be the speaker, for Aaron does not become the speaker. Moses is Yahweh's mouthpiece in the sequel, and acquits himself admirably of the task; while Aaron has not a single word to say. The objection is overcome by Yahweh's power and presence teaching Moses what to speak. So in the subsequent narrative in each interview with Pharaoh Yahweh dictates just what Moses shall say, and Moses says it. Moses' objection of incapacity is fully met by vs. 12, and vs. 13 recognizes the fact; for the sense here is, "Anyway, even if you have given me utterance, send some one else."

The first words of iv. 14, which are not probably the insertion of an interpolator, give the natural sequence to this reply: "Yahweh's anger was kindled." But for several reasons I cannot think that vs. 14^b-18 is the natural or original sequel to vs. 10-14^a. In 14^b the scene is Horeb, as in E; this appears both from "He cometh forth to meet thee" and from the connection with vs. 27. Aaron is made spokesman "*unto the people*"; whereas in J it is the interviews with *Pharaoh* which Moses dreads, since the elders will hearken to his voice (iii. 18, iv. 31). But in J Aaron does not appear as spokesman at all. Moses is spokesman, and exhibits no incapacity. Aaron does not appear as a speaker; though later, in xix. 22 ff., xxiv. 1 f., 9 f., he is apparently priest, and 1 Sam. ii. 27 ff. refers to a story, now lost, of how the priestly family was chosen in Egypt in bondage in Pharaoh's house. Elohim in vs. 16 might be accounted for in J as appropriate to the sense, but the conception of the prophetic relation is characteristic of E, and, finally, vs. 17 and the connection of the passage with vs. 27 are decisive. There is a break after vs. 14^a, and

it appears not only from the J characteristics of vs. 10-14^a followed by peculiarities of E in 14^b-18, 27 f., but from the omission of any consequence of Moses' faithlessness and Yahweh's anger. The appointment of Aaron to be Moses' assistant ("He shall be thy spokesman, . . . and thou shalt be to him as God," vs. 16) is not a punishment and does not appear to be uttered in anger. What Yahweh did after Moses had provoked him to anger does not now appear. It has been displaced by E's story of Aaron's appointment to be Moses' prophet to the people. Perhaps the rabbis were right in saying that the punishment of Moses here was deprivation of the priesthood. In that case we should understand why Aaron is introduced as "Aaron the Levite," a phrase which after ii. 1 we should not expect to meet in E. The phrase, "I know that he can speak well" (cf. iii. 19 f., ix. 30), and vs. 15, which adopts the language of vs. 12 to apply it to both Moses and Aaron, whereas it must have applied originally to Moses only, form, then, the bridge by which R passes from J's conception of Aaron as priest to E's of Aaron as prophet.

With regard to vs. 18-26 there is no disagreement of consequence: vs. 18, 20^b, characterized by "Jethro" and "the rod of God," are certainly E's; vs. 19, 20^a, 24-26 unmistakably J's. The "lodging-place" is doubtless the same as in J's version of the Joseph story. In verse 20 בְּנֵי should of course be בְּנִי, in accordance with vs. 24 ff. and ii. 22, where there is but one son; if Zipporah has two sons we cannot understand why she should circumcise one and not the other. Infant circumcision is here derived from the ancient practice of bridegroom circumcision. Cornill has recently argued for E as author of the story in Gen. xxxiv., where circumcision is introduced as already a custom in Israel.⁶ In vs. 20^b it is worth while to observe that E preserves Elohim in the expression "rod of God," and similarly in "mount of God," vs. 27. These are set phrases which must have appeared constantly in his source, and, of course, could not be altered in the few passages where he himself writes using "Yahweh." This use accordingly corroborates the theory above stated.

The manner in which Moses expresses himself to Jethro is significant. "My brethren" does not, of course, mean merely Aaron. It might be taken as referring to Moses' immediate kindred; but we are bound, other things being equal, to take the expression in the same sense here as in ii. 11 f., "Moses . . . went out unto his brethren," "a

⁶ *Zeitschrift f. Alttest. Wissenschaft*, xi. 1 (1891).

Hebrew, one of his brethren." But is it a great nation of 600,000 armed men, inhabiting a large district of Egypt, "too many and too mighty" for the Egyptians, and employed in the building of two cities, of whom Moses is solicitous to know whether they are yet alive or not? No; the author of this verse still presents Israel before his mind as a family or clan, a number of individuals in a certain Egyptian city, not a nation,—just as in i. 15 ff. he thinks of two midwives as sufficient to meet all the requirements of the Hebrews. In other words, E preserves much more closely than J the connection of the period of the exodus with the patriarchal period of Genesis. In J there is a sudden chasm, a great gap, between Genesis, where Israel's history is treated under domestic and clan relations, and Exodus, where we pass suddenly to the treatment of Israel as a great nation. The transition is effected by the simple statement, "And Joseph died and all his brethren, and all that generation." An indefinite lapse of time ensues, of which we learn only that Israel multiplied and waxed exceeding mighty, and spread abroad until they were "too many and too mighty" for the Egyptians. I do not think that J here means to limit his story to a period of four generations. But E unquestionably does. E informs us that "the children of Machir the son of Manasseh were borne upon Jacob's knees" (Gen. l. 23). Why this notice? Because Machir the son of Manasseh is famous as the possessor of Gilead (Num. xxxii. 40). Moses' mother in E is not *a* daughter, but *the* daughter of Levi (cf. Dillmann on Ex. ii. 1). In short, E both *must*, consistently with the time he allows in his story, and actually *does* carry over into the Egyptian period the conception of Israel as a family or clan, and not so very numerous. Ex. xii. 37 f., Num. xi. 21, and all the expressions in J E descriptive of the immense multitude of Israel, as if the nation of David's time had come just so out of Egypt, are J's, and that for independent reasons. Here we have, then, the explanation of another preposterous incongruity, which Colenso has mercilessly exposed. E by itself is not absurd: if you do not insist upon an enormous multitude, the Israel of the Exodus may be derived from the single family of Genesis in four generations, or even less (Jacob to Machir; Levi to Moses). J by itself is not absurd: if you do not insist on the three or four generations, but leave an indefinite period, two to three millions may be supposed to come from seventy persons. It is the putting of the two together which produces the absurdity; and accordingly it is to J E

as *combined* that we must look for the source of P's statistical extravagances.

Verses 21–23 anticipate the narrative of chapter xi. f. Moses does not, and in the nature of the case cannot, execute this command. The object of the verses is purely didactic; they have no pertinence to the narrative, and are doubtless, as Jülicher points out, from D², the same hand as in iii. 19 f.

In verses 27–31 we have obviously a combination of J and E. Verse 27, where contrary to vs. 20^a, 24 ff., Moses is still in the wilderness; Aaron as the recipient of the message Moses has to deliver; and the expression “mount of God” make vs. 27, 28 certainly E's. Verse 30^b likewise, and the first clause of vs. 31, “and he did the signs in the sight of the people, and the people believed,” must also, of course, belong to the author of iv. 1–9; viz. E. On the other hand, vs. 29, 30^a, and 31 from וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ is the verbal fulfilment of the direction to Moses in iii. 16 ff. (J). Also וַיִּקְרֹא וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶי, vs. 31 is characteristic of J; cf. Gen. xxiv. 26, Ex. xii. 27. Aaron, according to the practice elsewhere discussed, has here been introduced by JE' in two places, and the consequent ambiguity in vs. 30 was removed by changing the personal pronoun after אֱלֹהִים to דָּבָר.

In reviewing the portions thus set on one side or the other as J or E according to marks of style, situation, and language, we naturally look to see whether there is not in the respective portions that shade of difference in the conception which always exists in two different minds, even when contemplating practically the same facts. Such a difference in point of view, it seems to me, exists, and corresponds with the preceding and following parts of each document respectively.

In J Yahweh appears to Moses in Goshen among his people and declares that he, Yahweh, has come down to deliver them from their affliction, and bring them out to a land flowing with milk and honey. Moses is to call together the elders and go with them to present a demand to Pharaoh. This demand is not to be for liberation; but negotiations are to be opened with Pharaoh by presenting a request to be allowed to go three days journey into the wilderness and sacrifice. The outcome will be that Yahweh will bring the nation to the land of Canaan; but Moses is to serve as Yahweh's ambassador to Pharaoh, presenting first this demand. He will have no difficulty with the elders in persuading them to go with him, for they “will hearken to his voice.” Moses acts, then, from the first in conjunction

with the nation ; or rather Yahweh acts, and Moses stands together with the body of the people, presenting their demand. The author looks forward to a series of negotiation with Pharaoh, in which first Moses and the elders, afterward Moses alone, will be the mouthpiece of Yahweh, and Yahweh will take whatever action is necessary to coerce Pharaoh and to bring the nation to Canaan. Moses will speak with the support of his people ; but he must be their spokesman to Pharaoh, and hence will need above all to speak well. Moses objects that he has no power of utterance. Yahweh replies that he will give him utterance. Moses declines absolutely, and Yahweh is angry and perhaps deprives Moses of some intended benefit, which is bestowed on his brother "Aaron the Levite." Thereafter Moses delivers his message to the elders, and it is received with grateful obedience. As Moses' mission is to be spokesman for Yahweh and the people, and to conduct a series of negotiations with Pharaoh, it is natural that his objection should be "O Lord, I am not eloquent."

According to E Moses is away from his people at Horeb. He has never stood together with them, and has no reason to think they are ready to accept his mission. On the contrary, his previous experience in the attempt to serve as their benefactor has been discouraging in the extreme, and he is now more than ever isolated from "his brethren." He is directed to go to them with a message from God, that he himself is divinely appointed to be their leader, to go to Pharaoh, and bring Israel forth out of Egypt. Moses objects first that he is unqualified for this task. God meets this objection by promising that he will be with him, and, as a guarantee that the result shall surely be brought to pass, gives him this very spot, consecrated by the theophany, as the place to which he, Moses, is to lead the people forth to worship the God of their fathers. Moses objects that the people will want to know who guarantees this enterprise. He receives the revelation of the name Yahweh, and is entrusted — so we must supply from iv. 17 — with miraculous powers for the coercion of Pharaoh. He is also assured (21 f.) that the people shall go out laden with riches of which they have despoiled their Egyptian neighbors. He objects further that the people will not accept him as a divinely authorized agent, and is instructed in three signs by which he can establish the reality of his divine commission. He shall be Yahweh's agent and representative, bearing the rod which brings to pass the results ; and Aaron, whom Yahweh will send out to meet

him, will stand between him and *the people* as spokesman, to expound to them the divine requirement. Moses accordingly returns to Jethro and takes his leave, entrusting to his father-in-law his wife and children. On his return journey, again arrived at Horeb, he meets Aaron, whom Yahweh has sent forth, and together they proceed to the fulfilment of their joint commission.

The difference in point of view between these two narratives seems to result partly from the difference in conception of Moses' relation to his people, and partly from a different apprehension of the work to be done. In E Moses' difficulty is the authentication of his mission before the people; all other obstacles vanish before the marvellous efficacy of the wonder-working rod. Just as in the sequel Moses' mission to Pharaoh is briefly described by E in a series of strokes of the rod with which he is armed, until Pharaoh yields, and just as heretofore (Ex. ii. 11 ff.) Moses has found it a difficult matter to secure the sympathy of his own people, so now that part of the task which consists in securing acceptance as Yahweh's agent by his own brethren, seems to assume the greatest importance in the author's eyes. As soon as he has the assurance that God will be with him, and is divinely equipped with "signs and wonders," Moses drops the objection based on his own weakness. On the contrary, in J, the negotiation with Pharaoh are the dreaded obstacle all the time. In E Moses is a man of action, commissioned to act; whatever cannot be accomplished by a simple exhibition of his divinely given powers, but requires language, is assigned to Aaron. In J, according to iv. 10 Moses has, indeed, not been heretofore a man of words, but he has to become so, and is made so in vs. 11 f., for negotiation with Pharaoh is the part he has to play. The action is all Yahweh's. Moses does not have to construct a nation out of Israel and place himself at the head of it, because Israel is a nation with all the necessary organization of elders and officers; and in it he himself already possesses a recognized position. What he has to do is to act as Yahweh's and the nation's spokesman to Pharaoh.

There should be no difficulty in recognizing J as author of the *Hauptbericht* in chap. v. Verse 3 is exactly the message Moses is sent to give in company with "the elders of Israel" in iii. 18 (J), and stands connected with the series of J passages referring to the three-days journey into the wilderness and the sacrifice to Yahweh so

often referred to already. In vs. 5 Pharaoh objects to the people's being permitted to rest from their burdens, on the ground that they are so numerous. The idea corresponds to that of i. 11 (J), where the burdens are originally imposed because Israel is "too many and too mighty." The taskmasters and the public works in brick are familiar to us from J in chap. i. According to vs. 14, Israel is organized under its own officers, Egyptians only serving as general superintendents. This corresponds with J's conception, but not with E's of a people scattered among the Egyptians. In vs. 12 they are scattered abroad (a J expression; cf. Gen. x. 18, xi. 9), which implies that they were previously together in their own district. The means resorted to to humble them and break down the restive spirit of the people is the same as i. 8-12; viz. heavier work (vs. 9).

Finally the expressions and language are J's: נִגְשִׁים (= שָׂרֵי מִסִּים) of i. 11) 6, 10, 14 (cf. iii. 7); 9 שָׂעָה (only Gen. iv. 4, 5); 7; 12; 14; "Yahweh look upon you and judge," 21 (cf. Gen. xvi. 5); "made us to stink in the eyes of Pharaoh," etc. (cf. Gen. xxxiv. 30); אֲרִירִי to Yahweh, 22; מֹאזִי 23; Moses as spokesman to Pharaoh, 23, contrary to iv. 16 and v. 1; "I am come down to deliver" in the same verse, referring to the promise of Yahweh in iii. 8 (J), — all point to J.

Furthermore the chapter is in the main a unit. Verse 9 has a clear reference to the declaration of vs. 3, "The God of the Hebrews hath met with us," which it characterizes as "lying words." Verses 8 and 17 refer to the latter part of the same verse. Verses 7 f., 14, 19, similarly are inseparably linked together. Only in vs. 1-4 is there a clear case of duplication: vs. 1 = vs. 3, and vs. 2, 4 = vs. 5, 6. As vs. 3 is certainly J's we should expect to assign vs 1, 2, 4 to E, and we do in fact find them characterized by E's peculiarities. According to iii. 18 the ambassage to Pharaoh consist of "Moses and the elders," Moses being the spokesman; and thus vs. 23 of this chapter understands the event to have occurred. "They" in vs. 3 is therefore Moses and the elders. In vs. 2 and 4, on the contrary, the embassy is Moses and Aaron acting together, doubtless in the relation defined in iv. 16 (E). The phraseology of vs. 1 ("Yahweh, the God of Israel," instead of "the God of the Hebrews"; "Let my people go," instead of "Let us go . . . and sacrifice") differs from the series of J passages, iii. 18, vii. 16, and comes into nearer relation with the briefer narrative of E. The bringing up of the question of who Yahweh is,

reminds us of iii. 13 f. The interview is abruptly ended at vs. 2, and it only remains for Pharaoh to dismiss Moses and Aaron, which he does in vs. 4. The last clause of vs. 1, "That they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness," is perhaps a reference to the promise of iii. 12, "Ye shall serve God on this mountain," or to a missing portion of E; or it may perhaps better be considered an editorial addition intended to assimilate the demand of this verse to that of vs. 5 (cf. vs. 2 twice—"let Israel go"). Otherwise this brief, abruptly terminated interview is just what we should expect from the narrative of E elsewhere. If the last clause of vs. 1 is editorial, the demand is from the outset for liberation. Pharaoh refuses it on the ground that he recognizes no authority in the name of Yahweh, and dismisses Yahweh's agent. It remains for the supernatural signs to be wrought which shall coerce him.

Taking out these three verses, which form a complete parallel narrative by themselves, we leave a practically complete and uninterrupted narrative of J. It lacks, according to iii. 18, only the words at the beginning, "And Moses and the elders came unto Pharaoh." Its perfect self-consistency and unity of thought is marred only by two slight changes. In vs. 6 and 10 the word *ואת־שטריי* is an editorial addition; for as appears from vs. 14 ff., the Hebrew officers did not understand that this command really emanated from Pharaoh, it having come to them only through the taskmasters. Further, the *שטריים* cannot be thus first twice spoken of and afterward, in vs. 14, the explanation given of who they are, but vs. 14 originally introduced them for the first time; in fact they have no part to play until after vs. 14. This emendation, is, however, of a merely textual character. In verse 20, also, "Aaron" doubtless stands for an original "the elders." The reason for the change has already been made clear. Finally, vi. 1 has been heretofore treated as a genuine part of E (JOURNAL, ix. 183). The tone and attitude of the verse seem to me, however, to resemble that of the Deuteronomic interpolator, who assumes the functions of the chorus in Greek tragedy, standing between the author and the reader, commenting on what is happening or going to happen, expounding the moral of events, and usually anticipating the narrative, Compare iii. 19 f., iv. 21-23, viii. 6, 18, ix. 14-16, 19-21, 29^b, 30, x. 1^b, 2, xi. 9 f. The phrase *יד הוֹקֵה*, as applied to Yahweh's bringing Israel out from Egypt, seems to be confined to D², Ex. iii. 19 f, vi. 1, xiii. 9, xxxii. 11; Deut. xxxiv. 11.

If we supply, instead of vi. 1, simply וַיֵּאמֶר יִרְיָה אֶל מֹשֶׁה, the narrative of E will be sufficiently complete.

Looking back over our division of J and E in Ex. i.-vii., we find some slight differences in point of view. Taking the acknowledged and broader differences in conception and the characteristics of style and language as the basis of analysis, we obtain an exacter understanding of the divergences between J and E in their conception of the details, and find these to correspond with what we discover in their narratives elsewhere. It turns out to be possible to separate two nearly complete strands of narrative in Ex. i.-vi. as well as vii.-xii., and these strands join on both at their beginning and end so as to correspond with the regular thread of the story. One cannot feel the same confidence in chapter iv. as in chapters vii.-xii., but at least it ought not to be said hereafter that the separate threads of J and E are lost in Ex. i.-xii. Others will have analyses differing somewhat from the present; but I am convinced that at least analysis is possible here as well as in Genesis. Let us see what our results have been and whether they give fair satisfaction or not.

J's narrative according to this analysis comprised Ex. i. 6, 7 in part, 8-12, 14 in part, 20^b; ii. 15-22, 23^a; iv. 19, 20^a, 24-26; then iii. 7 f., 16-18; iv. 10-13, 14^a, 29, 30^a, 31 (from וַיִּשְׁמַע); v. 3, 5-23*.

E's narrative included i. 15-ii. 14 (except i. 20^b); iii. 1-6*, 9-14, and traces in 19 f., 21 f.; iv. 1-9, 14^b, 16-18, 20^b, 27 f., 30^b, and וַיֵּאמֶר הָעָם in 31; v. 1, 2, 4; and perhaps a trace in vi. 1.

JE^r introduced iv. 15; "Reuel" in ii. 18; "Aaron" in iv. 29, 30, v. 20; "the priest of Midian" in iii. 1; the שֹׁטְרִים in v. 6 and 10; altered אֱלֹהִים to יִרְיָה twice in iii. 2 and 4; and בָּנִי to בְּנֵי in iv. 20.

D² interpolated the comments, iii. 15, 19, 20; iv. 21-23; vi. 1.

This includes all the JE element of Ex. i.-vii.

* Traces of modification by R.